

Gibbon 109579RE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 10 2006

REMARKS

The claims are presented in a form that includes the addition, without underlining, made in the patent that is being reissued by means of a Certificate of Correction dated February, 2002.

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Shahraray et al. It is not clear what reference the Examiner is using in the rejection because line U of the "Notice of References Cited" is an article by Shahraray, but that is by that author alone. The reissue was filed because in applicants' *citation of art letter* applicants neglected to cite the article that was identified in the body of the original application. This article is by Shahraray et al, and because this formally-considered article matches the authors identified by the Examiner, it is assumed that it is this reference that triggered the 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

Claim 28 is amended to explicitly indicate that the step of automatically transforming the electronic data representation into a hypertext format includes hypertext links. As amended, it is respectfully submitted that claim 28 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

Claims 8-17 and 22 were objected to as being improper, for failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claims. Applicants respectfully traverse. Claim 8 limits claim 1 by explicitly defining (a) that the step of automatically transforming comprises more than one output format, and (b) that one of the formats is a standard format. A "standard" format is a format that is provided absent an explicit specification for some other format. Claim 9 depends on claim 8, and includes the further limitation that the output of the automatic transforming comprises a subset of the representative frames. Claims 11-17 depend on claim 9, and each of them includes a different limitation regarding the nature of the developed subset. Applicants believe that each of the claims does further limit the claim upon which it depends. If the Examiner decides to maintain the objection with respect to any of the claims, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to focus on the operative clause of each of the rejected claims and explain why, in the Examiner's view, the claim fails to provide the "further limiting."

Claim 22 is amended to remove the word "standard." Though in the context of claim 22 the terms "standard" meant that there are a number of formats that are available

Gibbon 109579RE

to a user from which one can be selected – in contradistinction to the user explicitly specifying *each aspect of the output format* – in order to remove any confusion relative to use of this term in claim 8, the word “standard” is removed. It is respectfully submitted that this does not broaden the patent and that, indeed, it does not alter the breadth of claim 22 at all.

Claim 9 is amended to further limit the claim, by specifying that the size of the transcript is reduced.

I light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner’s objections and rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,
David Crawford Gibbon
Behzad Shahraray

Dated: 7/10/06
btk

By Henry T. Brendzel

Henry T. Brendzel
Reg. No. 26,844
Phone (973) 467-2025
Fax (973) 467-6589
email brendzel@comcast.net